

D R A F T

EDEchols (21 Oct 60)

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director (Support)

SUBJECT : Responses to the Inspector General's Report on Training  
in the Central Intelligence Agency

1. This memorandum is for information.

2. The Inspector General's report represents a most thorough and comprehensive compression of [redacted] facts, beliefs, and theories pertaining to the evolution and present status of the training program in CIA. It presents, with clarity and accuracy, the present scope, nature and [redacted] reputation of the total training effort in the Agency. Further, it identifies with precision the actual or potential areas of deficiency in our training efforts. Above all it establishes the need for continuing studies to ensure that the total training effort of the Agency is adequate to our needs.

3. The report also contains numerous general and specific recommendations. For the most part I am unable and unwilling to categorically agree or disagree with these recommendations. This is so because I personally have not the knowledge upon which to base definitive conclusions; in addition, there has not been sufficient time or opportunity to engage in the study and analysis that would be requisite to considered judgments. With these qualifications, I nonetheless attach our cursory views on each recommendation involving functions, interests and responsibilities of the Office of Personnel

4. More important, however, is my concern that most of the recommendations inherently convey the implication that a policy decision has been reached to expand and improve the training program of the Agency almost without regard to cost in terms of money and manpower. I do not believe such is the case and my interpretation of the situation of the Agency with respect to its budgetary and manpower situation is that each significant decision requiring money and manpower will be based upon thoroughly developed and considered programs held to be of prime importance. In this light few if any of the recommendations in the report are without significant monetary and manpower implications and the nature and scope of the recommendations are too undefined to permit judgments at this time. For these reasons I would urge that any approval given to specific recommendations in the report be understood to be approvals for planning purposes only and without prior endorsement of the money and manpower inherently involved in any plan that might <sup>Logically</sup> ultimately be forthcoming.

5. This leads me to make what I consider to be my most ~~worthwhile~~ <sup>important</sup> comments on the report. First, I believe the report fails to identify the key <sup>in developing the Training program.</sup> problems of the Office of Training. Both the discussions in the text on the historic development of the CIA training program and the various specific recommendations indicate the major obstacles to the development of a proper training program for CIA. The difficulty is not, as is implied in paragraph B5 (page 6), that "The subordination of the Office of Training to the DD/S has also materially limited the power of the Director of Training to develop and to control unified Agency training policy." Neither is it because CIA has not

concentrated its training responsibilities "in a single authority and clothed with the power of the senior command." To the contrary, the true obstacles are clearly hinted at throughout the report. The basic difficulties are two: first, the Agency has histocially suffered from functional egocentrism and provincialism occasioned by the diversity of its activities and functional and security compartmentation; secondly, a training program can be no more advanced than the operational doctrine and personnel management program of an organization. Basically, and I think I am correct, I view the training program as a supporting activity - supporting both the operational program and the personnel program, <sup>Ther letter</sup> ~~which is itself~~ only a supporting program.

6. The one major conclusion that I derive from the survey is the need for a mechanism which on a continuing basis will unify at a sufficiently high command level all officials who do or should have the knowledge to bring into balance the operational, personnel, and training programs of the Agency. I support this conclusion by referring to the recommendations made in the report. An analysis quickly reveals that ~~in~~ almost every ~~instance~~ the recommendation requires that officers concerned with ~~Operations, Training and~~ personnel enter into joint study of a problem or alleged deficiency. In every case the hope and expectation is that there will be objective consideration of Agency needs, a reconciliation of conflicting views, and above all unanimity of determination among autonomous components to carry out a determined course of action. I conclude that the most important single action necessary to the

melding of Agency operational, personnel and training programs is the establishment of a primary mechanism just below the level of the DCI. I further submit that the CIA Career Council (under another [redacted] title, if desired) is the type of mechanism that can bring about concerted planning, reconciliation of conflicting views, and also inject through existing command lines the executive instructions that change theoretical policy into practice.

In urging that the CIA Career Council be used as the Agency mechanism to cope with the many facets of the training program, attention is called to the basic interrelationships of the personnel and training programs.

7. In a recent survey of the IG on Career Service in CIA, a recommendation was made for the establishment of an Agency level Personnel Development Board. The CIA Career Council recommended to the DCI that such a Board be established under the aegis of the Career Council. This Board would presumably concern itself with problems, policies and programs involved in the development of CIA personnel to meet personnel requirements at all levels of management but especially at the middle and senior levels. This specific recommendation was approved by the DCI.

8. We now are considering the IG report on training in CIA. Among the specific recommendations are the two which urge a program of middle career and senior officer training. It is obvious that when we speak of middle career and senior officer training and personnel development we concern ourselves with a single concept. I conclude therefore that the true solution to the development of a training program that is in balance with the operational and personnel programs of the Agency is to incorporate the training program in the area of consideration of the CIA Career Council. The exact organization is not important. I would suggest the CIA Career Council be preserved in name and that two subsidiary boards be established as follows:

- (a) Personnel Development Board to concern itself with the development of policies, programs and the mechanics of a system for personnel development.

(b) Training Program Development Board to concern itself with the development of policies, programs and the mechanics of operating and controlling the total Agency training program.

*Functional*

Representation on the Boards would be essentially the same as that of the Career Council. The Boards themselves, or at their direction responsible functional offices, or ad hoc task forces, or even standing subsidiary committees would study problem areas and develop and recommend policies and programs. The Boards would, ~~insofar as possible~~, <sup>and</sup> ~~reconcile divergent views~~, ~~represent the needs of their parent~~ component or function. Progress reports, policy impasses and ultimately specific proposals would be ~~submitted~~ <sup>submitted</sup> to the CIA Career Council for unanimous approval, modification or redirection. As appropriate, specific programs or major policy determinations would be referred to the DCI for decision.

9. A possible objection to this proposal is that the Director of Personnel is presently the Chairman of the CIA Career Council. Actually I feel that the DD/S should be the Chairman, in view of the predominantly support nature of the matters to be brought to the Council for consideration. I would then recommend that the Director of Personnel be Chairman of the Personnel Development Board and also Executive Secretary to the Council for personnel matters and that the Director of Training be Chairman of the Training Development Board and Executive Secretary to the Council for training matters. The organizational <sup>at this point</sup> ~~details~~ are not important. The fact remains that only at the ~~Assistant~~ <sup>Deputy</sup> Director level is it possible to reconcile the divergent interests and separatist tendencies of CIA and also to direct participation in joint activities with a

nonparochial viewpoint and to direct and enforce compliance with policies unpopular at lower echelons but determined to be in the best interests of the Agency.

10. In closing I urge serious consideration be given to this proposal or some other which will equally well advance the cause of objective and cohesive planning of the developmental course the Agency will follow in future years.